

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

KENNETH CORNWALL, LUCAS KATZE,
STEVE GRIFFIN and SHELDON SISCO,
Individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

SOLTERMAN ROOFING COMPANY, INC.

Defendant.

ORDER

10-cv-264-wmc

David E. Rohrer, Shana R. Lewis and Lathrop & Clark have filed a motion for leave to withdraw as counsel for defendant Solterman Roofing Company, Inc., in this matter, supported by Attorney Rohrer's sworn affidavit. Dkt. #17. Because the motion appears well-founded, the court would ordinarily grant it. As a legally-recognized business entity, however, defendant cannot defend in court without being represented by a lawyer. *United States v. Hagerman*, 545 F.3d 579, 581-82 (7th Cir. 2008). The court will, therefore, reserve a ruling on the motion for leave to withdraw until defendant has been given an opportunity to advise the court whether it objects to the withdrawal of counsel and, if so, on what grounds. Alternatively, defendant should notify the court that it does not object and has either engaged new counsel or is in the process of doing so.

If defendant does not respond to this opportunity to be heard by October 4, 2010, an order will be entered granting the motion to withdraw and directing defendant to indicate whether it intends to retain new counsel or default. In keeping with this order, Mr. Rohrer is ordered to immediately (1) provide notice to his client of this order, (2) remind it of all

impending deadlines in this case, including in particular those for dispositive motions, witness and exhibit disclosures, final pre-trial conference and trial, and (3) urge his prompt retention of new counsel and the likely draconian consequences of its failing to do so in light of its legal status and those deadlines.

Entered this 23rd day of September, 2010.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

WILLIAM M. CONLEY
District Judge